



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

10.00 103 A. 512

21C 11-07-86

#491
OW
3/5/87

In re application entitled: INVERTER CIRCUITS

Applicant: Ole K. Nilssen

Serial No: 06/787,692

Filed: 10/15/85

Group Art Unit: 212

Examiner: WILLIAM H. BEHA

RECEIVED

MAR 12 1987

GROUP 210

I, OLE K. NILSEN, HEREBY
CERTIFY THAT THE DATE OF
DEPOSIT WITH THE U.S. POSTAL
SERVICE OF THIS PAPER OR FEE
IS: 1-5-87

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Applicant provides the following response to Office Action
dated 11/07/86.

INITIAL REMARKS

In the first paragraph on page 2 of his latest office action, Examiner states that:

"Frank et al was discovered during the search of an unrelated case, and it demonstrates just how unduly broad applicant's claims are".

Would Examiner please explain to Applicant what official definition exists in respect to what constitutes an "unduly broad" claim.

Exactly what is an unduly broad claim?

In Applicant's view, an unduly broad claim is nothing more than a claim that is so broad as to be covered by some prior art reference.

100 02/27/87 787692 1 103 40.00 CK

Contrary to Examiner's allegation to the effect that Applicant's claims are unduly broad, the actual situation is that Examiner's search was unduly narrow -- as amply demonstrated by the belated finding of a more appropriate reference.

As a result of the inadequate breadth of Examiner's initial search, Applicant's Amendment A and the pending appeal have been rendered inappropriate, thereby having caused Applicant to waste a great deal of valuable time and energy.